



**CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
PRESERVATION BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING

MONDAY – OCTOBER 24, 2016 — 4:00 P.M.

1520 MARKET ST. #2000

ST. LOUIS, MO. 63103

www.stlouis-mo.gov/cultural-resources

Approval of the September 26, 2016 Minutes — Approval of the current Board Agenda

PRELIMINARY REVIEWS	Jurisdiction:	Project:	Page:
----------------------------	----------------------	-----------------	--------------

A. 1425 ANGELICA	Hyde Park District	Demolish a 4-family brick building	1
------------------------	--------------------------	--	---

B. 1429 ANGELICA	Hyde Park District	Demolish a 2-family building	7
------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------------	---

APPEALS OF DENIALS	Jurisdiction:	Project:	Page:
---------------------------	----------------------	-----------------	--------------

C. 3232 LONGFELLOW	Compton Hill District.....	Appeal of Director's Approval of alterations completed without permit.	13
--------------------------	----------------------------	---	----

D. 3826-28 RUSSELL.....	Shaw Neighborhood District.....	Appeal of Director's Denial to retain wall constructed without permit.	17
-------------------------	---------------------------------	---	----

SPECIAL AGENDA ITEMS	Address:	Page:
-----------------------------	-----------------	--------------

Nominations to the National Register

E. 138 TH INFANTRY MISSOURI NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY.....	3660 Market Street.....	20
---	-------------------------	----

F. WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY DENTAL DEPARTMENT BUILDING.....	2647-49 Locust Street.....	22
--	----------------------------	----



CITY OF ST. LOUIS
**PLANNING & URBAN
DESIGN AGENCY**
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
FRANCIS G. SLAY, Mayor

A.

DATE: October 24, 2016
ADDRESSES: 1425 Angelica
ITEM: Demolition of a Four-Unit Building
JURISDICTION: Preservation Review District Ordinance and Hyde Park Historic District, Hyde Park
Neighborhood, Ward 3
STAFF: Daniel Krasnoff, Cultural Resources Office



1425 ANGELICA

OWNER/APPLICANT:

LRA

Shirley Saunders – Option

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Preservation Board approve demolition this Merit building due to severe structural deterioration.



THE PROJECT:

The applicant has a six-month option to purchase or lease this property. She owns an adjacent four-unit apartment building to the north, on Blair Avenue. The building proposed for demolition has been vacant for a number of years. It came under LRA ownership in 2003. The Cultural Resources office denied demolition in 2009. The applicant would like to create a community garden on the site. Demolition in the Hyde Park Historic District must be considered with great care. Though justified in this instance, it is essential that future demolitions due to structural deterioration are minimized to the greatest degree possible.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION:

The property at 1425 Angelica is listed a contributing building to the Hyde Park Certified Local Historic District and is subject to the Preservation Review District and Hyde Park Historic District ordinances.

St. Louis City Ordinance #64689

PART X - DEMOLITION REVIEWS

SECTION FIFTY-EIGHT. Whenever an application is made for a permit to demolish a Structure which is i) individually listed on the National Register...the building commissioner shall submit a copy of such application to the Cultural Resources Office within three days after said application is received by his Office.

St. Louis City Ordinance #64832

SECTION ONE. Preservation Review Districts are hereby established for the areas of the City of St. Louis described in Exhibit A.

SECTION FIVE. Demolition permit - Board decision.

All demolition permit application reviews pursuant to this chapter shall be made by the Director of the Office who shall either approve or disapprove of all such applications based upon the criteria of this ordinance. All appeals from the decision of the Director shall be made to the Preservation Board. Decisions of the Board or Office shall be in writing, shall be mailed to the applicant immediately upon completion and shall indicate the application by the Board or Office of the following criteria, which are listed in order of importance, as the basis for the decision:

- A. Redevelopment Plans. Demolitions which would comply with a redevelopment plan previously approved by ordinance or adopted by the Planning and Urban Design Commission shall be approved except in unusual circumstances which shall be expressly noted.

Not applicable.

- B. Architectural Quality. Structure's architectural merit, uniqueness, and/or historic value shall be evaluated and the structure classified as high merit, merit, qualifying, or noncontributing based upon: Overall style, era, building type, materials, ornamentation, craftsmanship, site planning, and whether it is the work of a significant architect, engineer, or craftsman; and contribution to the streetscape and neighborhood. Demolition of sound high merit structures shall not be

approved by the Office. Demolition of merit or qualifying structures shall not be approved except in unusual circumstances which shall be expressly noted.

This is a contributing building to the Hyde Park Certified Local Historic District.

C. Condition. The Office shall make exterior inspections to determine whether a structure is sound. If a structure or portion thereof proposed to be demolished is obviously not sound, the application for demolition shall be approved except in unusual circumstances which shall be expressly noted. The remaining or salvageable portion(s) of the structure shall be evaluated to determine the extent of reconstruction, rehabilitation or restoration required to obtain a viable structure.

1. Sound structures with apparent potential for adaptive reuse, reuse and or resale shall generally not be approved for demolition unless application of criteria in subsections A, D, F and G, four, six and seven indicates demolition is appropriate.

The building is sound, per the ordinance. Its potential for rehabilitation is severely limited by structural failure of the rear wall and roof. An engineer's report has been submitted which documents the building's deterioration. Two developers active in the area have stated they cannot economically renovate the building.

2. Structurally attached or groups of buildings.
Not applicable.

D. Neighborhood Effect and Reuse Potential.

1. Neighborhood Potential: Vacant and vandalized buildings on the block face, the present condition of surrounding buildings, and the current level of repair and maintenance of neighboring buildings shall be considered.

Though there are many occupied structures on the block, there are also a large number of boarded up buildings.

2. Reuse Potential: The potential of the structure for renovation and reuse, based on similar cases within the City, and the cost and extent of possible renovation shall be evaluated. Structures located within currently well maintained blocks or blocks undergoing upgrading renovation will generally not be approved for demolition.

The building's reuse potential for rehabilitation is severely limited by structural failure of the rear wall and roof. Two developers active in the area have stated they cannot economically renovate the building.

3. Economic Hardship: The Office shall consider the economic hardship which may be experienced by the present owner if the application is denied. Such consideration may include, among other things, the estimated cost of demolition, the estimated cost of rehabilitation or reuse, the feasibility of public or private financing, the effect of tax abatement, if applicable, and the potential for economic growth and development in the area.
Not applicable

E. Urban Design. The Office shall evaluate the following urban design factors:

1. The effect of a proposed partial demolition on attached or row buildings.
Not applicable.

2. The integrity of the existing block face and whether the proposed demolition will significantly impact the continuity and rhythm of structures within the block.

The demolition will have a significant impact on the block face because it is close to the corner.

3. Proposed demolition of buildings with unique or significant character important to a district, street, block or intersection will be evaluated for impact on the present integrity, rhythm, balance and density on the site, block, intersection or district.

This building contributes to the character of the streetscape.

4. The elimination of uses will be considered; however, the fact that a present and original or historic use of a site does not conform to present zoning or land use requirements in no way shall require that such a nonconforming use to be eliminated.

Not applicable.

F. Proposed Subsequent Construction. Notwithstanding the provisions of any ordinance to the contrary, the Office shall evaluate proposed subsequent construction on the site of proposed demolition based upon whether:

1. The applicant has demonstrated site control by ownership or an option contract;

The applicant has a six-month option from LRA.

2. The proposed construction would equal or exceed the contribution of the structure to the integrity of the existing streetscape and block face. Proposal for creation of vacant land by demolition(s) in question will be evaluated as to appropriateness on that particular site, within that specific block. Parking lots will be given favorable consideration when directly adjoining/abutting facilities require additional off-street parking;

The loss of the building will negatively impact the streetscape. The community garden will be a good temporary use, though, the lot's location makes it a candidate for redevelopment.

3. The proposed construction will be architecturally compatible with the existing block face as to building setbacks, scale, articulation and rhythm, overall architectural character and general use of exterior materials or colors;

Not applicable.

4. The proposed use complies with current zoning requirements;

Not applicable.

5. The proposed new construction would commence within twelve (12) months from the application date.

Not applicable.

- G. Commonly Controlled Property. If a demolition application concerns property adjoining occupied property and if common control of both properties is documented, favorable consideration will generally be given to appropriate reuse proposals. Appropriate uses shall include those allowed under the current zoning classification, reuse for expansion of an existing conforming, commercial

or industrial use or a use consistent with a presently conforming, adjoining use group. Potential for substantial expansion of an existing adjacent commercial use will be given due consideration.

The applicant owns an adjacent property and the residents of that property feel unsafe residing next to the vacant structure.

- H. Accessory Structures. Accessory structures (garages, sheds, etc.) and ancillary structures will be processed for immediate resolution. Proposed demolition of frame garages or accessory structures internal to commercial or industrial sites will, in most cases, be approved unless that structure demonstrates high significance under the other criteria listed herein, which shall be expressly noted.

Not applicable.

St. Louis City Ordinance #57848 – Hyde Park Historic District Standards

“No building or structure within the Historic District shall be demolished, and no permit shall be issued for the demolition of any such building or structure, unless the Landmarks and Urban Design Commission and the Community Development Agency both shall find that the building or structure is in such a state of deterioration and disrepair or is so unsound structurally as to make rehabilitation impracticable.”

Based upon the building’s condition and the advice of competent real estate developers, there is substantial reason to believe that the building’s deteriorated state means that it is not feasible to rehabilitate.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Cultural Resources Office’s consideration of the criteria for demolition led to these preliminary findings:

- 1425 Angelica is a contributing building to the Hyde Park National Register Historic District.
- It is a “Merit” building.
- The house has been condemned by the Building Division.
- The building is sound, in terms of the Ordinance.
- The severe deterioration of the building in combination with its questionable feasibility justifies approval of its demolition.

Based on these preliminary findings, the Cultural Resources Office recommends that the Preservation Board reverse the Director’s denial of the demolition permit and grant the demolition due to the building’s severe deterioration. Though justified in this instance, it is essential that future demolitions due to structural deterioration are minimized as much as possible in the Hyde Park Historic District.



DETAIL OF FRONT AND EAST FACADES



DETAIL OF ROOF FAILURE



1425 ANGELICA (REAR)



CITY OF ST. LOUIS
**PLANNING & URBAN
DESIGN AGENCY**
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
FRANCIS G. SLAY, Mayor

B.

DATE: October 24, 2016
ADDRESSES: 1429 Angelica
ITEM: Demolition of A Two-Unit Building
JURISDICTION: Preservation Review District Ordinance and Hyde Park Historic District , Hyde Park
Neighborhood, Ward 3
STAFF: Daniel Krasnoff, Cultural Resources Office



1429 ANGELICA (RIGHT)

OWNER/APPLICANT:

LRA

Shirley Saunders – Option

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Preservation Board approve demolition this Merit buildings due to severe structural deterioration.



THE PROJECT:

The applicant has a six-month option to purchase or lease this property. She owns an adjacent four-unit apartment building to the north, on Blair Avenue. The building has been vacant for a number of years. It came under LRA ownership in 2001. The building was condemned in 2007 and 2013. The Cultural Resources office denied demolition in 2002, 2007, 2008 and 2009. Though justified in this instance, it is essential that future demolitions due to structural deterioration are minimized as much as possible in the Hyde Park Historic District. The applicant would like to create a community garden on the site.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION:

The property at 1429 Angelica is listed a contributing building to the Hyde Park Certified Local Historic District and is subject to the Preservation Review District and Hyde Park Historic District ordinances.

St. Louis City Ordinance #64689

PART X - DEMOLITION REVIEWS

SECTION FIFTY-EIGHT. Whenever an application is made for a permit to demolish a Structure which is i) individually listed on the National Register...the building commissioner shall submit a copy of such application to the Cultural Resources Office within three days after said application is received by his Office.

St. Louis City Ordinance #64832

SECTION ONE. Preservation Review Districts are hereby established for the areas of the City of St. Louis described in Exhibit A.

SECTION FIVE. Demolition permit - Board decision.

All demolition permit application reviews pursuant to this chapter shall be made by the Director of the Office who shall either approve or disapprove of all such applications based upon the criteria of this ordinance. All appeals from the decision of the Director shall be made to the Preservation Board. Decisions of the Board or Office shall be in writing, shall be mailed to the applicant immediately upon completion and shall indicate the application by the Board or Office of the following criteria, which are listed in order of importance, as the basis for the decision:

- A. Redevelopment Plans. Demolitions which would comply with a redevelopment plan previously approved by ordinance or adopted by the Planning and Urban Design Commission shall be approved except in unusual circumstances which shall be expressly noted.

Not applicable.

- B. Architectural Quality. Structure's architectural merit, uniqueness, and/or historic value shall be evaluated and the structure classified as high merit, merit, qualifying, or noncontributing based upon: Overall style, era, building type, materials, ornamentation, craftsmanship, site planning, and whether it is the work of a significant architect, engineer, or craftsman; and contribution to the streetscape and neighborhood. Demolition of sound high merit structures shall not be

approved by the Office. Demolition of merit or qualifying structures shall not be approved except in unusual circumstances which shall be expressly noted.

This is a contributing building to the Hyde Park Certified Local Historic District.

C. Condition. The Office shall make exterior inspections to determine whether a structure is sound. If a structure or portion thereof proposed to be demolished is obviously not sound, the application for demolition shall be approved except in unusual circumstances which shall be expressly noted. The remaining or salvageable portion(s) of the structure shall be evaluated to determine the extent of reconstruction, rehabilitation or restoration required to obtain a viable structure.

1. Sound structures with apparent potential for adaptive reuse, reuse and or resale shall generally not be approved for demolition unless application of criteria in subsections A, D, F and G, four, six and seven indicates demolition is appropriate.

The building is sound, per the ordinance. Its potential for rehabilitation is severely limited by structural failure of the rear wall and roof. An engineer's report has been submitted which documents the building's deterioration. Two developers active in the area have stated they cannot economically renovate the building.

2. Structurally attached or groups of buildings.
Not applicable.

D. Neighborhood Effect and Reuse Potential.

1. Neighborhood Potential: Vacant and vandalized buildings on the block face, the present condition of surrounding buildings, and the current level of repair and maintenance of neighboring buildings shall be considered.

Though there are many occupied structures on the block, there are also a large number of boarded up buildings.

2. Reuse Potential: The potential of the structure for renovation and reuse, based on similar cases within the City, and the cost and extent of possible renovation shall be evaluated. Structures located within currently well maintained blocks or blocks undergoing upgrading renovation will generally not be approved for demolition.

The building's reuse potential for rehabilitation is severely limited by structural failure of the rear wall and roof. Two developers active in the area have stated they cannot economically renovate the building.

3. Economic Hardship: The Office shall consider the economic hardship which may be experienced by the present owner if the application is denied. Such consideration may include, among other things, the estimated cost of demolition, the estimated cost of rehabilitation or reuse, the feasibility of public or private financing, the effect of tax abatement, if applicable, and the potential for economic growth and development in the area.
Not applicable

E. Urban Design. The Office shall evaluate the following urban design factors:

1. The effect of a proposed partial demolition on attached or row buildings.
Not applicable.

2. The integrity of the existing block face and whether the proposed demolition will significantly impact the continuity and rhythm of structures within the block.

The demolition will have a significant impact on the block because it is on the corner and faces a city park.

3. Proposed demolition of buildings with unique or significant character important to a district, street, block or intersection will be evaluated for impact on the present integrity, rhythm, balance and density on the site, block, intersection or district.

This building contributes to the character of the streetscape.

4. The elimination of uses will be considered; however, the fact that a present and original or historic use of a site does not conform to present zoning or land use requirements in no way shall require that such a nonconforming use to be eliminated.

Not applicable.

F. Proposed Subsequent Construction. Notwithstanding the provisions of any ordinance to the contrary, the Office shall evaluate proposed subsequent construction on the site of proposed demolition based upon whether:

1. The applicant has demonstrated site control by ownership or an option contract;

The applicant has a six-month option from LRA.

2. The proposed construction would equal or exceed the contribution of the structure to the integrity of the existing streetscape and block face. Proposal for creation of vacant land by demolition(s) in question will be evaluated as to appropriateness on that particular site, within that specific block. Parking lots will be given favorable consideration when directly adjoining/abutting facilities require additional off-street parking;

The loss of the building will negatively impact the streetscape. The community garden will be a good temporary use, though, the lot's location makes it a candidate for future redevelopment.

3. The proposed construction will be architecturally compatible with the existing block face as to building setbacks, scale, articulation and rhythm, overall architectural character and general use of exterior materials or colors;

Not applicable.

4. The proposed use complies with current zoning requirements;

Not applicable.

5. The proposed new construction would commence within twelve (12) months from the application date.

Not applicable.

- G. Commonly Controlled Property. If a demolition application concerns property adjoining occupied property and if common control of both properties is documented, favorable consideration will generally be given to appropriate reuse proposals. Appropriate uses shall include those allowed under the current zoning classification, reuse for expansion of an existing conforming, commercial

or industrial use or a use consistent with a presently conforming, adjoining use group. Potential for substantial expansion of an existing adjacent commercial use will be given due consideration.

The applicant owns an adjacent property and the residents of that property feel unsafe residing next to the vacant structure.

- H. Accessory Structures. Accessory structures (garages, sheds, etc.) and ancillary structures will be processed for immediate resolution. Proposed demolition of frame garages or accessory structures internal to commercial or industrial sites will, in most cases, be approved unless that structure demonstrates high significance under the other criteria listed herein, which shall be expressly noted.

Not applicable.

St. Louis City Ordinance #57848 – Hyde Park Historic District Standards

“No building or structure within the Historic District shall be demolished, and no permit shall be issued for the demolition of any such building or structure, unless the Landmarks and Urban Design Commission and the Community Development Agency both shall find that the building or structure is in such a state of deterioration and disrepair or is so unsound structurally as to make rehabilitation impracticable.”

Based upon the building’s condition and the advice of competent real estate developers, there is substantial reason to believe that the building’s deteriorated state means that it is not feasible to rehabilitate.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Cultural Resources Office’s consideration of the criteria for demolition led to these preliminary findings:

- 1429 Angelica is a contributing building to the Hyde Park National Register Historic District.
- It is a “Merit” building.
- The house has been condemned by the Building Division.
- The building is sound, in terms of the Ordinance.
- The severe deterioration of the building in combination with its questionable feasibility justifies approval of its demolition.

Based on these preliminary findings, the Cultural Resources Office recommends that the Preservation Board reverse the Director’s denial of the demolition permit and grant the demolition due to the building’s severe deterioration. Though justified in this instance, it is essential that future demolitions due to structural deterioration are minimized as much as possible in the Hyde Park Historic District.



1429 ANGELICA (REAR)



1429 ANGELICA (WEST FAÇADE)



CITY OF ST. LOUIS
**PLANNING & URBAN
DESIGN AGENCY**
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
FRANCIS G. SLAY, Mayor

C.

DATE: October 24, 2016
ADDRESS: 3232 Longfellow Boulevard
ITEM: Appeal of the Director's Approval of an addendum to a previously-issued permit,
proposing to install a door on a rear addition
JURISDICTION: Compton Hill Local Historic District — Ward 6
STAFF: Andrea Gagen, Preservation Planner, Cultural Resources Office



3232 LONGFELLOW BLVD.

OWNER/APPLICANT:

The 5700 Property LLC – Mark Benckendorf

APPELLANT:

Compton Heights Betterment Association

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Preservation Board uphold the Director's approval, as the doors comply with the Compton Hill Historic District Standards.



THE CURRENT WORK:

The Cultural Resources Office received a complaint that a door was being installed on a new rear addition at 3232 Longfellow. The permit for the addition itself was approved by the Director of the Cultural Resources in January 2016. Upon inspection, it was found that French doors had been installed on the side elevation without a permit, and the owners were cited. Subsequently, they applied for a permit to retain the doors. The permit was approved as the doors meet the Compton Hill Historic District standards. In the Compton Hill Historic District, if there is a conflict between the historic district standards and the restrictive covenants, the more restrictive applies. The Compton Hill Neighborhood Association has appealed the Director's decision.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION:

Excerpt from Ordinance #57702, the Compton Hill Historic District:

F. Exterior Materials

1. Materials for new or rehabilitated structures shall be compatible in type, texture and color with the original building material. If the building is new, materials shall be compatible in type, texture and color with the predominant original building materials used in the neighborhood.
2. The use of raw concrete block and imitations or artificial materials are not permitted. Aluminum or other types of siding are permitted only when they are used in the place of wood siding and are similar in detail and design to the original siding. Mill finished aluminum is not permitted. Previously unpainted brick surfaces shall not be painted.

G. Architectural Detail

1. Architectural details on existing structures shall be maintained in a similar size, detail and material. Where they are badly deteriorated, a similar detail may be substituted.
2. Doors, windows and other openings on rehabilitated structures shall be of the same size and in the same horizontal and vertical style as in the original structures. Exterior shutters, when used, shall be made of wood and shall be of the correct size and shape to fit the entire opening for which they were intended.
3. Storm doors, storm windows, and window frames shall be of wood, color finished material. Mill finished aluminum or similar metal is not permitted.
4. Renovated dormers, towers, porches, balconies or cornices shall be maintained in a similar profile, size and detail as originally constructed. Similar new construction shall complement the design.
5. New ancillary and satellite structures shall conform in design to the architectural style of the period in which the principal structure was built.

6. New gutters and downspouts shall be of copper or other color finished or painted material. Awnings and canopies where visible from the street are not generally appropriate, but when approved shall be of canvas or canvas-like material.

Complies. Compton Hill Historic District standards do not specifically address doors on new construction/additions.

Compton Hill Improvement Company Deed Restrictions:

1. A building line is established individually from the street and no building or part may extend over, except the steps and platform in front of the main door – and even that may not be more than eight feet.
2. Only one building, and that a private residence, on any lot. Absolutely no flats or businesses.
3. The building, with the exception of the portes cochere, may not be closer to the side of the lot than 10 feet.
4. If a building does not cost at least \$7,000 (compared to Westmoreland Place-\$7K and Portland Place-\$6K), the plans must be submitted to the improvement company. No fence or wall can be put on the side lines for 30 feet back from the building line. The existing grade of the lot for 60 feet from the street cannot be changed more than 12 inches without consent of the owner of the adjoining lot.
5. A subsequent successor or buyer will be bound by the same restrictions.

The doors do not appear to violate the deed restrictions placed on this property.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION:

The Cultural Resources Office's consideration of the Compton Hill Historic District standards and the Compton Hill deed restrictions led to these preliminary findings.

- 3232 Longfellow Blvd. is located in the Compton Hill Local Historic District.
- The doors were installed without a permit, but a permit was later applied for and approved by the Cultural Resources Office.
- The Compton Hill Historic District standards do not specifically address doors on new construction/additions.
- The deed restrictions do not appear to apply in this case.

Based on these preliminary findings, the Cultural Resources Office recommends that the Preservation Board uphold the Director's approval of the application to retain side doors as the doors comply with the Compton Hill Local Historic District standards.



SIDE DOORS INSTALLED WITHOUT A PERMIT



VIEW OF DOORS FROM SIDEWALK



CITY OF ST. LOUIS
**PLANNING & URBAN
DESIGN AGENCY**
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
FRANCIS G. SLAY, Mayor

D.

DATE: October 24, 2015
ADDRESS: 3826-28 Russell Boulevard
ITEM: Appeal of Director's to replace a retaining wall
JURISDICTION: Shaw Neighborhood Local Historic District — Ward 8
STAFF: Andrea Gagen, Preservation Planner, Cultural Resources Office



3826-28 RUSSELL BLVD.

OWNER/APPLICANT:

Michael & Mary E. Bender

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Preservation Board uphold the Director's denial, as the retaining wall does not comply with the Shaw Historic District Standards.



THE CURRENT WORK:

The Cultural Resources Office received a complaint that a front retaining wall had been installed at 3826-28 Russell Boulevard. Upon inspection, it was found that a low Versa-Lok retaining wall had been constructed without a permit, and the owners were cited. Subsequently, they applied for a permit to retain the wall. The permit was denied as the retaining wall does not meet the Shaw Neighborhood Historic District standards. The owner has appealed the decision. The issue was deferred from the August agenda and the record was left open from the September meeting.

The new wall is located at the top of the front terrace and encloses flower beds. As it is less than 18 inches in height, it does not require a permit from the Building Division, only from the Cultural Resources Office. A taller Versa-Lok retaining wall sited nearer the building was extant prior to the owners purchasing the property in 2011. The Office has no record of a permit for this wall.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION:

Excerpt from Ordinance #59400, the Shaw Neighborhood Historic District:

Residential Appearance and Use Standards

G. Walls, Fences, and Enclosures:

Yard dividers, walls, enclosures, or fences in front of building line are not permitted. Fences or walls on or behind the building line, when prominently visible from the street, should be of wood, stone, brick, brick-faced concrete, ornamental iron or dark painted chain link. All side fences shall be limited to six feet in height.

Does not comply. The proposed retaining wall would be constructed with concrete units which is not an approved material under the historic district standards. The wall sits in front of the building line which is also not allowed under the standards.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION:

The Cultural Resources Office's consideration of the Shaw Neighborhood District standards and the specific criteria for walls on a visible facade led to these preliminary findings.

- 3826-28 Russell Blvd. is located in the Shaw Neighborhood Local Historic District.
- The proposed Versa-Lok retaining wall is a concrete block product which is not an approved material under the historic district standards.
- The proposed wall sits in front of the building line which is not allowed under the historic district standards.

Based on these preliminary findings, the Cultural Resources Office recommends that the Preservation Board uphold the Director's denial of the application to retain a retaining wall as it does not comply with the Shaw Neighborhood Local Historic District standards.



RETAINING WALL INSTALLED WITHOUT A PERMIT



SIDE VIEW OF WALL



CITY OF ST. LOUIS
**PLANNING & URBAN
DESIGN AGENCY**
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
FRANCIS G. SLAY, Mayor

E.

DATE: October 24, 2016
ADDRESS: 3660 Market Street — Ward: 17
ITEM: Nomination to the National Register of the 138th Infantry Missouri National Guard Armory Building
STAFF: Bob Bettis



3660 Market Street

PREPARER:

Michael Allen & Lynn Josse

OWNER:

138th Infantry Missouri National Guard Armory

RECOMMENDATION:

The Preservation Board should direct the staff to prepare a report for the State Historic Preservation Office that the property meets the requirements of National Register Criteria C.



RELEVANT LEGISLATION:

Section 101(c)(2)(A) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1996 (amended)

Before a property within the jurisdiction of the certified local government may be considered by the State to be nominated to the Secretary for inclusion on the National Register, the State Historic Preservation Officer shall notify the owner, the applicable chief local elected official and the local historic preservation commission. The commission, after reasonable opportunity for public comment, shall prepare a report as to whether or not such property, in its opinion, meets the criteria of the National Register.

PROPERTY SUMMARY:

The 138th Infantry Missouri National Guard Armory is located in St. Louis (Ind. City), Missouri, and is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C in the area of ARCHITECTURE. Completed in 1938, the massive Art Deco armory was one of the largest buildings constructed in St. Louis by the federal Public Works Administration (PWA) between 1933 and 1943, and an excellent example of the significant public works practices of Albert A. Osburg, Chief Architect, and William C.E. Becker, Chief Engineer for the Board of Public Service. The Armory embodies the patriotic goals of the PWA in encouraging cities to build in the Art Deco style, as well as the best traits of local designs in the style. The Armory also is noteworthy because St. Louis built few major works in the Art Deco style. Construction of the Armory was made possible by a \$16.1 million bond issue that St. Louis voters passed in 1934 to create matching funds for PWA grants that funded construction of the Armory, four community centers serving African-American neighborhoods, the Homer G. Philips Hospital and other buildings. Osburg, who earlier had designed the Renaissance Revival Soulard Market (1928) and the Biddle Market (1931), chose to employ the Art Deco style preferred by the WPA as the “look” of federal relief on all new building projects funded by the 1934 bond issue. The Armory was the largest single building that Osburg designed in this effort. Becker, designer of the city’s Jewel Box conservatory (1935), assisted Osburg. The resulting building is testament to the collaborative strength of the Board of Public Service in meeting civic needs while advancing aesthetic modernism. The period of significance covers the period of the building’s construction, 1937 through 1938. The Armory retains excellent integrity and conveys its appearance from the period of significance to this day.

The Cultural Resources Offices concurs that this property is eligible for listing in the National Register under Criteria C for architecture.



CITY OF ST. LOUIS
**PLANNING & URBAN
DESIGN AGENCY**
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
FRANCIS G. SLAY, Mayor

F.

DATE: October 24, 2016
ADDRESS: 2647 Locust Street — Ward: 6
ITEM: Nomination to the National Register of the Washington University Dental Dept. Building
STAFF: Bob Bettis



2647 LOCUST STREET

PREPARER:

Karen Bode Baxter & Tim Maloney

OWNER:

Elliot's Neighbor LLC

RECOMMENDATION:

The Preservation Board should direct the staff to prepare a report for the State Historic Preservation Office that the property meets the requirements of National Register Criteria A.



RELEVANT LEGISLATION:

Section 101(c)(2)(A) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1996 (amended)

Before a property within the jurisdiction of the certified local government may be considered by the State to be nominated to the Secretary for inclusion on the National Register, the State Historic Preservation Officer shall notify the owner, the applicable chief local elected official and the local historic preservation commission. The commission, after reasonable opportunity for public comment, shall prepare a report as to whether or not such property, in its opinion, meets the criteria of the National Register.

PROPERTY SUMMARY:

The Washington University Dental Department Building at 2647 Locust Street is eligible for local listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion A for Education.

The Second Renaissance Revival style building, constructed as an investment property for Washington University in 1909, is a five story, red brick, three-part commercial building. Due to its height compared to the mostly one- and two-story buildings surrounding the site, it commanded a prominent place in the streetscape. It was the first commercial building to be constructed on Locust St., west of Jefferson, in what had been a prominent residential area.

The Washington University Dental Department Building, located at 2647-49 Locust Street, St. Louis, Missouri, was designed by the notable St. Louis architectural firm of Eames and Young and constructed in 19021 for Washington University on the eve of the 1904 World's Fair (Louisiana Purchase Exposition). It is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A: Education as the only extant building associated with the Washington University School of Dental Medicine, the sixth dental college founded in the United States (and the first west of the Mississippi), at a time when dentistry was just becoming a medical profession.

The Cultural Resources Offices concurs that this property is eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A in the area of Education.

